



2009 GRANITE BAY COMMUNITY PLAN REVIEW SURVEY

SECTION III

SUGGESTED CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING LAND USE REQUESTS

(Please provide input on suggested-criteria and any new criteria that should be used to evaluate land use change requests.)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
AVAILABILITY OF SEWER	51%	34%	6%	7%	3%	1%

The comments below are numbered by commenter number.

Note: Due to rounding of numbers, percentages may not add up to 100

Comments:

- 13) No change
- 30) No new developments
- 34) Current capacity? If increase development not only increase direct sewage, but more run-off etc. This needs to be considered.
- 43) Up to property owner
- 46) No development without sewer
- 57) Depends on location.
- 77) Thought this was part of the review
- 59) MAC review
- 86) Itchy acres can stay septic
- 89) Do not increase sewer capacity for any density increases. Current capacity serves remaining parcels developed as per current zoning – DO NOT increase capacity.
- 91) The plan should envision a timeframe when all properties are on sewer. Do away with septic.
- 93) As provided by Sewer Maintenance District # 2.
- 96) IF it perks you should be able to have septic.
- 109) To be fully paid by developer to include reimbursement to land holders who have paid earlier bond indebtedness.
- 111) Owner must be in a sewer district.
- 116) Use existing criteria.

- 118) Must be in sewer district
- 119) Must be in sewer district.
- 122) Septic options and consider future
- 153) Owner must be in a sewer district.
- 154) Property must be in Sewer District.
- 161) nearby existing sewer lines
- 164) As long as the expense for connecting the sewer is borne by the developer or the homeowner seeking the connection.
- 180) Unless septic is an option.
- 245) I think this depends on lot size, location.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
AVAILABILITY OF WATER	58%	36%	3%	1%	2%	1%

The comments below are numbered by commenter number.

Note: Due to rounding of numbers, percentages may not add up to 100

Comments:

- 13) No change
- 17) We were asked to conserve 20% of water use. Therefore, we do not have enough water for any new development
- 30) No new developments
- 34) The projections of supply aren't very encouraging
- 35) Agency should "refuse to service" if not in their master plan for build out
- 46) San Juan water, but a well in addition.
- 59) MAC review
- 77) Thought this was part of the review
- 89) Do not increase water capacity for any density increase. Current capacity serves remaining parcels developed as per current zoning. Do not increase capacity to increase density.
- 91) Water is a limiting factor. We have pastures we could not irrigate.
- 93) As provided by San Juan Water (some emergency services cross-connection with PCWA).
- 96) Wells are fine.
- 101) Wells OK
- 109) To be fully paid by developer to include reimbursement to land holders who have paid earlier bond indebtedness.
- 116) Use existing criteria.
- 122) Present and future
- 157) The existing communities regularly flood the gutters – even in drought years.

161) Nearby existing water lines.
 164) As long as the expense for connecting the sewer is borne by the developer or the homeowner seeking the connection.
 174) Need to use more water. GB should be a green zone. Price of water for AG/Res is too high. More green belts will provide more rainfall in Sierras.
 240) Provided that septs are not available

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
LAND USE COMPATABILITY WITH ADJACENT PROPERTIES	68%	23%	3%	5%	1%	0%

The comments below are numbered by commenter number.

Note: Due to rounding of numbers, percentages may not add up to 100

Comments:

13) No change
 30) Keep as is
 35) Yes, no more spot development out of scale with surrounding land use.
 43) Yes
 54) This is a major factor in people asking for changes - they want smaller lot sizes that do not reflect the surrounding community.
 59) MAC review
 69) Too vague
 77) Important part of Placer
 89) Current plan addresses this issue. Do not change current plan
 91) Incremental downzoning (higher density) degrades adjacent property values. Properties should be compatible as much as possible.
 93) Transition buffers are appropriate in some cases.
 104) Please do not allow residential properties to be rezoned commercial.
 109) Compatibility is essential to community harmony.
 111) No spot zones. Adjacent properties that are contiguous.
 114) No less
 116) Use existing criteria.
 118) Keep present zoning
 132) There are exceptions such as along Douglas Boulevard and Auburn Folsom Road. Mixed use should be encouraged in terms of density.
 148) An on same street.

- 153) Stay within present zoning for contiguous properties.
- 154) Must be same as contiguous properties
- 155) To include zoning
- 164) This doesn't mean it has to be exactly the same.
- 170) Important to accommodate diversity of land use – need a mix of lot sizes. Can be done if planned properly
- 174) Ag/Res on all with some minor restriction on animals per acre.
- 240) Provide smooth transitions from land use to land use or density to density.
- 245) It is patently unfair to change zoning in a substantial manner when surrounding neighbors buy a property expecting certain adjacent zoning

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
LOT SIZE COMPATABILITY	61%	23%	8%	6%	2%	0%

The comments below are numbered by commenter number.

Note: Due to rounding of numbers, percentages may not add up to 100

Comments:

- 2) A minimum of one acre lots size – no smaller.
- 5) One acre OK per site
- 8) It depends
- 13) No change
- 18) Don't change – No Enclave project at 27 houses
- 30) Keep as is
- 37) No more than 2.3 acres or one acre
- 43) yes
- 46) No rezoning
- 50) Neighbors and long time residents have invested in community with expectations that surrounding lands will not be rezoned or re-designated to different land use.
- 55) Compatibility does not have to mean exactly the same.
- 57) How would this be defined?
- 59) MAC review
- 66) Lot size should never be smaller than 2.3 acres.
- 69) Too vague
- 70) Large projects might serve as a transitional density to achieve a higher density as long as they match the densities along the property

lines.

75) Do not allow lots below one acre minimum next to those of 2.3 acres or greater. They are not compatible with surrounding areas and uses.

77) Important part of Placer

86) We are next to 20,000 square foot lots, then we jump to 4.6 acres to 20 acres.

89) Current plan addresses this issue. Do not change current plan.

91) Incremental downzoning (higher density) degrades adjacent property values. Properties should be compatible as much as possible.

93) Land use compatibility is the more important issue

111) Compatible with contiguous properties.

116) Use existing criteria.

119) Must be compatible with contiguous properties

132) New land use requests should have a zoning limit capped by the size of the lots surrounding the parcels to be rezoned. For example, if current zoning is 6 homes on 12 acres, take an average of the lot sizes which is 1.5 – which means 8 – no more than 12 homes could be built.

153) Must be compatible with contiguous properties.

154) Must be same as adjacent properties.

155) To include zoning

164) This doesn't mean it has to mirror its neighbors.

165) With adjacent properties.

170) Need mix of sizes constant with use (a large church) could be adjacent to a small lot development if planners planned careful. Important to accommodate diversity of lane use. Can be done if planned carefully.

174) 2.3+

240) To preserve the character of neighborhoods. Lot sizes should be roughly equal and transitions should be gradual/incremental.

245) It is patently unfair to change zoning in a substantial manner when surrounding neighbors buy a property expecting certain adjacent zoning

CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS (OAK WOODLANDS, WETLANDS, FLOODPLAINS, ETC.)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	69%	16%	8%	5%	3%	0%

The comments below are numbered by commenter number.

Comments:

13) No change

Note: Due to rounding of numbers, percentages may not add up to 100

41) This set of considerations is too often used to stop growth in a community. These limits for oak trees, wetlands, and wild animals can bring our Granite Bay to a slow demise.

54) We can never get the oaks back after they are out – So important – when these are gone and not protected we have lost our rural nature and we become just any other congested city – Roseville, citrus heights, Orangevale, etc.,

59) MAC review

77) Important to keeping Granite Bay amenities.

78) A given

89) Current plan addresses this issue. Do not change current plan, except to disallow new development to demolish existing wetlands, oaks, floodplains, other woodlands and pay into funds that fund creating these natural resource somewhere else.

91) Preserve and enlarge as much as possible.

93) Part of any site specific land planning process

96) Cottonwoods are not heritage trees, they are weed trees. They are dangerous from branches falling and messy from cotton.

111) Pass through of Baughman Creek on Itchy Acres.

116) Use existing criteria.

161) Trees, wetlands, etc, contribute a great deal to rainfall and water control. Every effort should be made to preserve these items in lieu of possible climate change and CA need for water.

164) And impact on surrounding and nearby properties.

174) Leave as is

240) This is too vague and provides not definitive guidance. Define what are acceptable mitigation factors and what is incurable/unacceptable/immitigable.

SHOULD THE PROJECT PROVIDE A COMMUNITY BENEFIT (I.E. FISCAL, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL)?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
	41%	25%	24%	5%	4%	1%

The comments below are numbered by commenter number.

Note: Due to rounding of numbers, percentages may not add up to 100

Comments:

8) I don't know what you mean. Sounds nice

10) Sure

13) No change

21) We do not want new projects

24) Additional property tax income to the County should not be considered a community benefit for purposes of rezoning to decrease minimum lot sizes.

26) Don't know

- 30) No new developments
- 35) How can fiscal be benefit when the County gets the money.
- 41) The projects should not be used as a revenue source to the community at large unless the new residence themselves will benefit from the community too.
- 45) And also consider whether to maintain the existing rural feel of Granite Bay. Do not develop to merely develop.
- 50) Community benefit should not be used as single point other positives must also be present.
- 51) Social and cultural
- 53) Define project. How can one make a choice.
- 54) Intent of land use splits – do they have a buyer or will it site vacant after destroying the environment.
- 55) And not just money in the pockets of developers.
- 58) Of course it should provide a benefit to the community, but it should not be used just to benefit any specific individual or entity only.
- 59) MAC review
- 60) Should be based on approved uses permitted by the zoning, not staff's perception of social benefit.
- 70) The larger the project, the more it should contributes to the developed infrastructure that will support its residents.
- 71) I'm concerned that any fiscal benefits (jobs, increased property and sales tax, etc) will be quickly cancelled out by increased traffic and the loss of environmentally sensitive habitat.
- 77) Impacts should also be considered.
- 78) Not necessary.
- 83) Should meet the goals and policies.
- 86) Is keeping the land and home sellable a community asset? Are leaving weeds a fire danger?
- 89) Current plan addresses this issue. Do not change current plan.
- 93) Those projects that do should be valued in proportion to defined community benefit.
- 109) Fiscal benefit to whom?
- 111) Is a must to rezone. Must be a positive benefit. Fiscal may not be a community benefit to existing community.
- 116) Use existing criteria.
- 122) Larger developments or for small thing – do no harm
- 128) No – higher density projects can all say that they have a fiscal impact. – more property taxes.
- 129) No fiscal – Big developments always means more money. Social – OK. Cultural – OK
- 130) Agree – Social, cultural. Disagree – fiscal.
- 131) Not fiscal. Developer can show financial benefit to tax base.
- 132) Yes agree with social and cultural. Do not agree with fiscal. All high density projects can expand tax base. Community benefit such as meeting a social need? Is there a social need for a project? Can the project demonstrate through data that such a need exists? Cultural – does the project enrich the lives of a majority of residents – not a small portion?
- 152) Drop fiscal.
- 153) Must be a benefit for all the community

157) Car was condos garages – are there community benefits? They have been loudly protested and here they are.

166) Where there are such benefits, they should be highlighted as such. Perhaps with more weighing versus a standard commercial development.

172) Could be included but not as a requirement.

174) No

178) No new development.

236) Yes, but not for rezones and not for fiscal. Fiscal is meaningless. What are we talking here? Tax revenue? Fiscal benefits of the property owner?

240) a) Better define what is a “benefit” to the community - would a substantial portion of current residents benefit from the project and would it enrich their quality of life.

b) Higher priority should be given to the consistency of parcel sizes and land uses with adjacent properties.

c) Community design standards should be incorporated in the plan.

d) A statement from the applicant as to why the project would be a benefit to the community and the applicant’s estimate of costs/benefits.

241) a) Loomis Basin General Plan requirements.

242) Impact of extra traffic, noise, adequate drainage on neighbor’s property.

244) Impact on traffic – creating more? Hazard?

245) If the project desires to be outside existing zoning and/or land use designations there should be a recognized, tangible benefit to the community as a reason for making any such change.